



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,008	01/11/2002	Namit Jain	OR01-07401	8148

51067 7590 09/20/2005

ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
c/o A. RICHARD PARK
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95616-2914

EXAMINER

ALOMARI, FIRAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,008

Applicant(s)

JAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Firas Alomari

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed 06/27/2005 has been accepted. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended; claims 2, 9 and 16 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding applicant argument that Meffert in view of Liu doesn't suggest the aspect of verifying the identity of both sender and the receiver. The examiner disagrees with applicant. Meffert explicitly disclose verifying the identity of the sender and the receiver by means of entering a password before enabling the user to send or receive content (*Meffert : Page 7, Paragraph 74*); Paragraph 70 in page 6 of the application is more specific as it disclose that "Logon password and certificate passphrase can be validated against the registry and the user profile. The passphrase is required to access the private key to permit decryption of the encrypted content" .

Furthermore Meffert discloses that even if the recipient is not registered the recipient will only be able to view the content after verifying recipient credential (*Meffert: Page 7, Paragraph 73*).

Regarding applicant arguments that Meffert doesn't discloses a third party system. The examiner agrees with the applicant. However, Meffert as modified

Art Unit: 2136

by Liu teaches using a third party system "Remailer" that perform non-repudiation services (*Liu: Page 2, Paragraph 18*) that keep record of transactions and making it impossible for either user to deny its involvement in content transfer (*Liu: Page 2, paragraph 26 & page 5, paragraph 45*). Claims 1 and 2 in the application are more specific as they disclose using a **third party system** to provide irrefutable proof that the recipient received a message or that a sender have sent that message.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meffert et al. US (2002/0059144) in view of Liu US (2002/0143710).

Regarding claims 1,8 and 15: Meffert discloses a method to facilitate secure messaging, comprising:

creating a message at an origin; (Page 7, Paragraph 72, lines1-4) computing a digest of the message; (Page 7, Paragraph 72, lines 14-18) signing the digest using an origin private encryption key; (Page 7, Paragraph 72, lines 41-21) sending the message and the digest to a queue ***located in third party device***

Art Unit: 2136

for delivery to a recipient;(Page 6, Paragraph 66 & Page 7, Paragraph 72 the control server and the database can be located on different devices or in the same device) receiving the message and the digest at the queue; (Page 8, Paragraph 76 lines 23-27) placing the message and digest on the queue **and persistently storing a record of this transaction** (Page 7, Paragraph 72 lines 21-25 / a tracking number is assigned to the package and stored.....the sent database is updated), and notifying the recipient that the message is available.(Page 8, Paragraph 76, lines 27-30) **generating a request at the recipient to receive the message from the queue located in the third party device;** (Page 7, Paragraph 74, lines 3-6) **creating a signature for the request using a recipient private encryption key; sending the request and the signature to the queue;**(Page 8, Paragraph 77, lines 14-23) **validating the request at the queue** (Page 7, Paragraph 38, lines 4-9) **and if the request is valid, sending the message to the recipient** (Page 7, Paragraph 38, lines 8-11 & Page 4, Paragraph 38, lines 3-6) but he doesn't explicitly disclose **Verifying that the digest was signed at the origin by using an origin public encryption key and notifying the recipient if the digest is verified and sending the message digest to the recipient if the request is valid; signing the digest at the recipient using the recipient private encryption key to create a signed digest; and validating the signed digest before sending the message.**

However Liu disclose a method for certified transmission system where he discloses generating a message digest and encrypting the digest to create a signature (Page 2, Paragraph 25) and verifying the signature at the server before

Art Unit: 2136

granting the recipient access to the document (Page 4, Paragraph 0037, lines 12-15 and Page 4, Paragraph 38); encrypting the message digest using the recipient private key (Page 4, Paragraph 37, Lines 1-8) and validating the signed digest at the queue using the recipient public encryption key before the transmission is complete (Page 4, Paragraph 37, lines 14-22). Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Meffert system with the teaching of Liu to include the steps of verifying the message signature before notifying the recipient of the message and sending the message digest to the recipient; creating a signed digest; and validating the signed digest before sending the message. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable the system to provide message *origin and/or destination* non-repudiation service for all messages (*Page 1, paragraph 5 & Page 4, Paragraphs 43-47*) . Additionally verifying the message digest at the server guarantees that the receipt provided by the server will be for the same message.

Claims 2, 9 and 16: Cancelled

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17: Meffert discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising passing the message and the digest through a plurality of queues between the origin and the recipient,(Page 6, Paragraph 68, lines 1-14) whereby the recipient and the origin are subscribers of different queues.(Page 6, Paragraph 69, lines 1-6 and Page 10, Paragraph 96, lines 1-9)

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 18: Meffert discloses the method of claim 3, further comprising passing the message and the digest through a plurality of databases, wherein each database in the plurality of databases includes at least one queue of the plurality of queues. (Page 6, Paragraph 66 and item 500 of FIG. 1)

Regarding claim 5, 12 and 19: Meffert discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the origin public encryption key and the origin private encryption key are a key pair of a public key encryption system. (Page 3, Paragraph 36 and Page 8, Paragraph 76, lines 13-27)

Regarding claim 6, 13 and 20: Meffert discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the recipient public encryption key and the recipient private encryption key are a key pair of a public key encryption system. (Page 6, Paragraph 65 and Page 7, Paragraph 70, lines 22-31)

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 21: Meffert discloses the method of claim 1, wherein computing the digest includes using one of message digest 2 (MD2), message digest 4 (MD4), message digest 5 (MD5), secure hash algorithm (SHA), and secure hash algorithm 1 (SHA1). (Page 7, Paragraph 72, lines 12-18)

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Firas Alomari whose telephone number is (571) 272-7963. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYAZ SHEIKH can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The


Art Unit: 2136

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FA

Firas Alomari
Examiner
Art Unit 2136


Primary Examiner
AU 2136
9/14/05